

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 90, 98, 103 and 106 - 117 are pending in the present application with claims 90, 98, 103, 114 and 115 being independent. Applicant has herein amended claims 90, 98, 103, 108, 111, 114, 115, and 117 and added claims 118 - 122. Support for these amendments may be found in at least paragraphs 0038 – 0063 and 0072 - 0083.

For at least the reasons stated herein, Applicant asserts that the claims as presented are patentable over the cited prior art and are therefore in condition for allowance.

### **Request for Continuing Examination**

This Amendment and Response is being filed with a Request for Continuing Examination (RCE).

### **Claim Objections**

The Examiner has objected to claims 98, 107, and 111-113 because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 98 which respectfully renders Examiner's objection moot.

### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

The Examiner has rejected claims 90, 98, 103 and 106-117 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,010,751 for Shneiderman ("Shneiderman") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,878 for Eintracht et al. ("Eintracht").

### **Shneiderman**

Respectfully, Shneiderman does not contemplate claim 90, element 14 as amended "obtaining data associated with said at least one result object from said second computer in response to said request, said data represents said identifying information provided by said providing user for said at least one result object, said data further comprising said identification

information about said providing user.” Shneiderman discloses software for electronically annotating electronic images through drop and drag annotations from a pre-defined list. Abstract. Shneiderman describes a PersonID which identifies persons within a photograph. However, Shneiderman does not disclose an identification of the person who originally provided the photograph. Respectfully, Shneiderman does not contemplate storing and displaying “data further comprising said identification information about said providing user.”

Respectfully, Shneiderman does not contemplate Applicant’s claim 90 elements 1 through 3 as amended “assigning a unique user identification to a providing user,” “accepting identification information about said providing user,” and “storing said unique user identification and said identification information about said providing user in a provider users database on a second computer.” Instead, Shneiderman discloses a Collection Table, a Linkage Table, an Images Table, and Appearance Table, and an Image Aspects Table. See Figure 2 of Shneiderman. However, Shneiderman does not disclose a “providing user database” which holds “unique user identification” and “identification information about said providing user.”

#### Shneiderman in view of Eintracht

Respectfully, Shneiderman in view of Eintracht does not contemplate claim 90 element 14 as amended. Instead, Eintracht discloses a unique user ID that forms a Note Owner identifier. Col. 8, lines 7 – 12. This Note Owner identifier is apparently used to keep track of the persons who make the annotations on a given document. See Figure 10 in Eintracht. However, Eintracht does not disclose storing and displaying “data further comprising said identification information about said providing user.”

Respectfully, Shneiderman in view of Eintracht does not contemplate claim 90 elements 1 through 3 as amended. Eintracht discloses a Client Annotation Event Data Structure (Figure 10), a Client Annotation Event Note Data Structure (Figure 11), a Server Annotation Response Data Structure (Figure 12), and a Server Annotation Response Note Data Structure (Figure 13).

However, Eintracht does not disclose a “providing user database” which holds “unique user identification” and “identification information about said providing user.”

Respectfully, the combination of Shneiderman and Eintracht do not comprise the limitations of Applicant’s independent claim 90 and as such are respectfully unable to be combined to form Applicant’s invention. Respectfully, the combination of Shneiderman and Eintracht do not comprise the limitations of independent claim 98, 103, 114, and 115 for the same reasons listed above with respect to Applicant’s claim 90. Claims 106, 108, 109, and 110 are dependent upon claim 90, and claims 107, 111, 112, and 113 are dependent upon claim 98, and claims 116 and 117 are dependent upon claim 115.

### **Summary**

Applicant respectfully submits that Shneiderman, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht teaches, suggests or discloses independent claim 90. Claims 106, 108, 109, and 110 are dependent upon claim 90, and are therefore allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Shneiderman, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht, teaches, suggests nor discloses independent claim 98. Claims 107, 111, 112, and 113 are dependent upon claim 98, and are therefore allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Shneiderman, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht, teaches, suggests or discloses independent claims 103, 114, and 115. Claims 116 and 117 are dependent upon claim 115, and are therefore allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons stated above.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Shneiderman, neither alone nor in combination with Eintracht, teaches, suggests or discloses claims 118-122.

Appl. No. 09/991,324  
Response dated 3/18/2009  
Reply to Office Action of 09/18/2008

### **Conclusion**

For at least the reasons stated herein, Applicant respectfully submits the claims as presented herein are patentable over the cited prior art and are therefore in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance for the claims in this case.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dalina Law Group, P.C.

/AD60958/

Allen D. Danner, Reg. No.: 60,958  
P. (626) 405-1413  
F. (858) 777-5425